DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 381 EC 231 195

AUTHOR Craft-Tripp, Marsha
TITLE Identifying and Evaluating Teacher Competencies in a Special Education Setting.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 53p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (68th, Toronto, Canada, April 23-27, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; *Consultants; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instruction; *Special Education Teachers; *Student Evaluation; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS North Carolina Appraisal Instrument; *Teacher Competencies

ABSTRACT

The paper reviews the literature on the four major competency areas for a special educator: assessment, instruction, consultation, and administration. It then looks at the North Carolina Appraisal Instrument and concludes that, since instruction is the predominant area assessed by this instrument, a revised instrument is needed to assess the other three competencies as well as the subtopic of instructional preparation. Attached tables provide: (1) a self self-rating scale for classroom management, (2) a listing of 18 competencies concerned with instructional organization, (3) a listing of 24 competencies concerned with teaching presentation, (4) a listing of 47 competencies concerned with essential collaborative consultation skills, (5) a listing of 18 functions of the resource teacher, (6) an integrated list of 33 competency areas for teachers of the handicapped based on the literature, (7) an integrated list of 16 competency areas for teachers of students with learning disabilities, and (8) the draft of the formative proposed assessment instrument for teachers of exceptional children. Contains 28 references. (DB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED320381

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.



# Identifying and Evaluating Teacher Competencies In A Special Education Setting

Marsha Craft-Tripp

Running head: Teacher Competencies

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Marsha Craft-Tripp
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC231195

Paper presented at the Annual Convention
of the Council for Exceptional Children
(68th, Toronto, Canada, April 23-27, 1990)

In recent years there has been a renewed interest in identifying competencies for teachers of exceptional children, especially those competencies needed for resource room teachers. The resource program model has evolved into the most widely used service delivery system for providing instruction to exceptional students. In addition, a growing body of research correlating teacher behaviors to student achievement compels exceptional children educators to identify best practices in teaching. However, the issue of teacher competencies in the field of special education has been controversial due to variation in definitions, professional training, and state regulations. Despite the lack of consensus, four broad areas have been identified from the research. They are:

1. Assessment
2. Instruction
3. Consultation
4. Administration

The purpose of this paper will be to discuss these four competency areas in detail. In stressing the importance of each of the four, it then becomes necessary to look at the N. C. Appraisal Instrument and to determine if this instrument adequately assesses these four areas.

## Assessment

In a broad sense, the "goal" of education is the same for all children, handicapped and non-handicapped: to graduate from high school with a mastery of basic literacy and numeracy skills and a foundation of knowledge of the physical and social world. This goal of education

is achieved in the mainstream. To the maximum extent possible, handicapped students participate in this mainstream educational system and derive benefits from it. Within that portion of the educational program provided by special education, a unique and individualized education is developed for each student. The purpose of assessment is for identifying whether or not referred students are handicapped and to provide the data upon which the individualized education program (IEP) will be based. This is the assessment of what to teach.

There are essentially two ways to collect the information needed for the determination of what to teach; by using formal and informal assessment data (Zigmond and Miller, 1986).

Formal Assessment

Formal assessment procedures involve the use of published tests. These tests are comprised of test items that sample knowledge or skills across content domains but are not specifically related to a single curriculum. Most formal assessments yield norm-referenced scores (i.e., age-equivalent, grade equivalent, or standard scores) that are derived from performance on individual items of the test.

In the Washington City Schools assessment instruments used for identification purposes are:

1) Wechsler Scales
2) Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Battery
3) Visual Motor Integration Test
4) Visual-Aural Digit Span
5) Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scale

6. Devereux Elementary School Behavior Rating Scale

7. Walker Problem Behavior Identification Checklist

8. Behavior Evaluation Scale

The assessment instrument utilized for planning the IEP is the Brigance Inventory of Essential Skills. The Brigance is used for identifying specific student objectives and for evaluating whether these objectives have been met. This inventory is used by teachers of the mentally handicapped, autistic, behaviorally/emotionally handicapped and the learning disabled. A computer program based on the Brigance is used by these teachers in developing appropriate IEP's for these students.

Informal Assessment

Informal assessment involves the use of teacher - made tests, observation protocols, and interviews. They sample curriculum - specific knowledge as well as observations of student behaviors. They are nonstandardized with respect to administration and scoring procedures and offer the teacher greater flexibility in obtaining measures of student performance (Zigmond and Miller, 1986).

Assessment data is utilized for selecting curriculum domains as well as selecting specific instructional objectives. The data from the formal testing completed as a part of the referral, classification, and placement procedure is used to identify "deficiencies" in the child's functioning. Correcting these "deficiencies" becomes the goal of special education and serves to define the broad curriculum focus for that child (Dugoff, Ives, and Shotel, 1985).

The practice of using assessment data to define the domains of the special education curriculum is widespread, but also has problems. The availability of a wide array of norm-referenced tests has prompted many educators to measure as many different kinds of behavior as possible to get a complete picture of a child's functioning. This may lead to the measurement of skills that may be only tangentially related to academic achievement and social development. In failing to recognize that uneven patterns of skills development are more the rule than the exception, spurious deficit skill domains have been identified and inappropriately incorporated into a special education curriculum plan and targeted for remediation (Zimond and Miller, 1986).

The perceptual deficits/perceptual training paradigm is such an example. Respected authorities (i.e., Frostig, Kephart) recommended the screening of handicapped students for problems in visual and auditory perception and remediation of any uncovered deficits. This came to be known as a defining feature of what was special about the education of many learning disabled students. Accumulating research evidence, however, failed to validate the assumed relationship between perceptual skills and academic achievement. Further, training in perceptual skill deficits was not shown to have an impact on achievement in academic subjects. (Arter and Jenkins, 1972).

An alternative approach advocated in recent years would seem to be more appropriate for selecting non-academic curricula, including early preacademic skills and social skills (Vincent et al., 1981). This alternative includes a careful analysis of what the child needs

to know (i.e., what skills a particular child who has a particular handicapping condition will need to master to adjust and perform well in a target environment. In this alternative, more functional approach, the assessment of what to teach requires first that the environment and its demands be evaluated. In this assessment direct observation and criterion - referenced testing would replace formal norm referenced testing. Examples of the functional approach can be found in the works of Lyon and Sainato (1985) and Zigmond, Kerr, Brown, and Harris (1984).

Once the domains of instruction are identified, the teacher must place the student at the appropriate level within the curriculum so that appropriate instructional objectives can be developed. This assessment for specific instructional objectives helps make instruction more targeted, more efficient, and more successful.

A procedure for assessment of what to teach is derived from the work of Resnick and her colleggues in the identification of hierarchies within structional domains (Resnick, Wang, and Kaplin, 1973) and from the task analysis model of skill acquisition. (Bijou, 1970). Within these models the teacher determines the student's level of skill mastery within a hierarchically arrayed sequence of skills. Formal tests seldom provide useful information about a student's level of skill mastery. In contrast, informal tests permit the teacher to collect data on skill mastery that lead directly to an identification of specific instructional objectives. Informal tests help the teacher to establish the beginning point in a sequence of skills in a given subject area.

They measure student performance in the every day tasks of actual classrooms and lead to a realistic specification of instructional objectives.

Zigmond (1983) recommends a twelve - step informal assessment strategy for determining what to teach. Using teacher - made and curriculum - embedded tests, this assessment gives specific data for instructional decision making within subject matter or skill domains. The first six steps involve planning for the assessment. The teacher decides what curriculum area is to be assessed, selects or develops a hierarchy to represent the skill domain, decides where along the skill hierarchy to begin the assessment, selects or develops a criterion - referenced survey test appropriate to that level, and organizes the classroom to administer the assessment. After the informal assessment survey is administered, the teacher evaluates the student's performance and analyzes error patterns. The outcome of these activities is a hypothesis about skill deficits that are tested out using informal probes. The assessment data is converted into instructional goals. The Enright Diagnostic Arithmetic Test is based on this model. The Zigmond strategy moves from broad surveys of competence to specific probes of skill deficiencies. This strategy uses a combination of systematic observation, task analysis assessment procedures, and error analysis of work products to yield information that helps the teacher identify short-form objectives for individualized instruction. Having to make the decision of what to teach is the unique responsibility of special educators (Zigmond and Miller, 1986).

## Instruction

Integrally related to competence in diagnostic assessment procedures and the essence of what is "special" about special education, is competence in the design, implementation, and evaluation of instructional programs to meet the individual needs of handicapped children. Although special education has been a testing ground for the design and implementation of systematic, data-based instructional programs, many graduates of professional training programs lack the skills to implement these principles and procedures (Stamm, 1980).

Within the instructional area, there are three broad teaching functions. They are classroom management, instructional organization, and lesson presentation (Englert, 1984). Each of these areas will be discussed along with implications for the special education classroom.

An important teaching function related to student achievement is to establish a classroom environment conducive to student learning and student attention to academic tasks. Good classroom management maximizes the time students spend on learning tasks, thus resulting in greater student achievement.

In special education, classroom management principles are premised on the assumption that teachers should teach appropriate social behaviors by establishing behavioral expectations in the form of behavioral rules, planning a signal system to elicit these behaviors and consequating appropriate and inappropriate behaviors in the presence of specific antecedent stimuli (Kerr and Nelson, 1983).

Studies confirm that the first few weeks of school are critical to the establishment of workable rules and routines that serve as a useful guide for student behavior the remainder of the school year. Effective managers do not assume that students come to school knowing appropriate behavior; rather they carefully teach and review each of these behaviors, including when and how these behaviors are to take place. In the well-managed classroom, rules are explained, posted, discussed, and a rationale for each rule is provided. Routines and procedures (e.g., lining up, movement about room, small group procedures, use of learning centers, talk among students) are introduced gradually as needed. Effective managers actually demonstrate or model the dimensions of the behaviors to be learned. Students are required to rehearse appropriate behavior in response to a given teacher signal. The teacher carefully monitors student behaviors during rule rehearsal and provides feedback specific to the rule (Bickel and Bickel, 1986).

According to the research of Kounin (1970) effective teachers of regular and special education students demonstrate "withitness" - the ability to monitor the entire class while directing the learning activities of a small group. They also exhibit the trait known as "overlappingness." This is the teacher's ability to not only attend to two events simultaneously, but also to actually direct and respond to students outside the context of the ongoing lesson.

In measuring teacher's effectiveness in managing classroom behavior, two general classes of measurement systems can be utilized. One

measurement system involves a self-study through a rating instrument that requires the teacher to rate himself on the specific classroom management variables of concern. A rating scale designed for this purpose is shown in Table I (English, 1984). The second type involves collecting pupil data in terms of the number of appropriate or inappropriate behaviors that occur during a specified observation period. This can indicate the teacher's success in teaching, monitoring, and maintaining the classroom rules and procedures.

Instructional organization is a second teaching domain that affects student learning. Within this domain, important teacher behaviors include those that maximize learning time, sustain a high level of student responding or practice and keep students engaged in the academic task.

Three organizational techniques can augment the time allocated for instruction and the opportunity for academic practice: lesson scheduling and management, small - group instruction, and tutoring systems. (Englert, 1984). A primary tactic special education teachers can use is to schedule generous amounts of time for instruction while decreasing the time spent in non-instructional activities, such as task management, socializing, and waiting for teacher assistance (Lein Lardt et. al, 1981). Adherence to lesson schedules can also increase the time available.

In addition to careful scheduling, research suggests that the time spent working with a number of students is positively correlated to achievement gains, whereas, the time spent working with one or two

students is negatively related to achievement gains. The primary means by which teachers can interact with a large number of students per hour is in grouping students for instruction. For example, a special education teacher with twelve students could teach only six students per hour if students were taught in one-on-one arrangements in ten-minute lessons. In contrast, if students were grouped for instruction into small groups of three students, one hundred percent of the students could be accommodated for instruction in fifteen minute lessons. In terms of the time students spend in seatwork, the first classroom situation means that six students work alone for an entire hour without instruction from the teacher; in the second situation, no student is left working alone without instruction or feedback (Englert, 1984). Finally, tutoring can be used to increase instructional time and to provide students with greater opportunities to make active academic responses. Because tutors are people other than the teacher, tutors can increase academic learning time without increasing the instructional demands placed on teachers.

Although emphasis has been placed on instructional time, the time should not be increased without consideration being given to student's task engagement. Several studies indicate that regular and special education students do not remain engaged in seatwork tasks unless they are actively supervised and monitored by an adult (Berliner and Rosenshine, 1977: Englert and Thomas, 1982). In addition to continually scanning the classroom and monitoring task involvement, successful managers maintain high mobility and circulate frequently. These frequent

interactions with students give teachers the opportunity to provide immediate assistance and continual feedback to students (Rosenshine, 1980). Accuracy on seatwork has been found to be an important factor contributing to student learning. Low achieving students need to work at high levels of accuracy in order to receive the full benefit of seatwork practice (90% accuracy).

Teachers must hold students accountable for their assignments and seatwork tasks. According to Evertson and Emmer (1982), more effective teachers keep track of student progress and work completed and require students to complete their work on time, according to specific work standards regarding format, neatness and accuracy. Similarly, Anderson's Study (1984) revealed that many teachers of low-achieving students did not make reference to what was being practiced and how it was related to other learning. Knowledge of the criterion task and goal has a critical effect on the amount special education students learn, so effective teachers inform students of the rationale and objectives when assignments are made.

To measure one's effectiveness in the domain of instructional organization a rating instrument (Table II) can be used to self-evaluate and identify areas of concern. To obtain more specific measures of instructional organization, other quantitative measures can be utilized. Teachers can compare daily planned schedules against actual observable times that lessons are started and stopped. Teachers also examine the proportion of students they involve in direct instruction opportunities per hour. A minimum percentage of students that should be involved

in direct instruction is seventy percent. Seatwork accuracy should also be monitored. To monitor this, teachers can graph individual student's percent accuracy on specific seatwork assignments. When performance consistently falls below 90%, teachers should reexamine seatwork tasks to determine whether they are of suitable difficulty and whether they provide additional practice opportunities in a previously taught academic skill (Englert, 1984).

Lesson presentation is the third domain in the instructional area. According to Rosenshine (1983) and Englert (1984), three major lesson phases signal different teacher behaviors. In the first lesson phase, teachers review the previous day's learning and prepare students for the upcoming lesson's activities. Teachers attempt to establish a link between the new information and what students already know. In the second phase, active demonstration and practice of new concepts are important and in the third stage, teachers continue to provide students with repeated practice opportunities.

In addition to the three phases, three general instructional practices are liked to pupil achievement. They are pacing, accuracy, and mastery learning. Special education settings may be considered unique since students learn at different rates and supposedly under different learning conditions. With such students, a high level of content coverage and brisk pace may be detrimental to the learning process. A slower pace may enhance pupil performance and motivation. However, according to Carnine (1981), when instruction is present at the student's level, instruction that is fast-paced and comprehensive

is associated with learning gains. Mastery learning formats can help teachers plan and evaluate the instructional program. In the mastery learning format teachers continually administer progress tests to evaluate student's mastery of prespecified learning outcomes. Remediation for individual students who do not achieve criterion on specific outcomes includes alternative instructional strategies and additional learning time. Once remediation has taken place, teachers administer another test to ascertain student's progress on targeted academic objectives. Because of the frequent monitoring of student progress and the individualized way in which instructional time is scheduled, mastery learning systems can be of great benefit to special education students (Guskey, 1980).

In measuring one's effectiveness in presenting lessons, a rating scale such as the one in Table III can be utilized. Listening to a tape recording of the lesson as the teacher completes the rating scale may be useful. In addition, the IEP can be used to evaluate the teacher's success in moving students through a specific set of targeted objectives according to prespecified timelines. Daily measurement and graphing of student performance on specific academic skills also helps to evaluate the immediate and long-term effects of instruction on student learning. (Englert, 1984).

In looking at instruction for special education students, it is important to consider the notion that different children learn differently and that instruction, to be individualized, must be adapted to specific

student learning characteristics. Traditionally, matching student characteristics and instructional methods (the aptitude - treatment interaction (ATI) procedure) was the predominant methodology. Solomon (1972) suggested that two approaches have characterized the use of differential treatments in search of improvements in student learning; the compensatory approach and the preferential approach. In the compensatory approach, the teacher tries to neutralize the incapacities that a student brings to the classroom. The teacher compensates for student deficits by circumventing them. In contrast, the preferential approach makes use of instruction that takes advantage of student strengths.

Implicit in the practice of matching student types to teaching types is the belief that there is "no one best way to teach all students" (Zigmond and Miller, 1986). Although this is probably true, the benefit of a priori matching of teaching approaches to particular student characteristics is not substantiated in the research literature. The research on ATI is extensive and it remains largely unsubstantiated as methods of choice with special students. There are two reasons for these results and they both bear directly on the assessment practices that are commonly used to determine how to teach. First, the tests that are used have such limited reliability and validity that actual differences among students are questionable. We are a long way from being able to identify which student attributes actually contribute to the need for differentiated instruction and a longer way from being able to measure these attributes adequately. Secondly, we are just

beginning to understand the nature of effective instruction and alternative treatments are probably not equally effective regardless of student characteristics (Zigmond and Miller, 1986).

Within a framework of effective teaching, the question of how to teach should be, how can good instruction be more responsive to individual differences? Data from trial teaching sessions and assessments of the effectiveness of instruction provide information on whether instruction should be adapted so that it will be more responsive to the needs of a handicapped student. With this approach, the focus is shifted from an analysis of student learning style to an analysis of student responsiveness to instruction (Zigmond and Miller, 1986).

Zigmond et al. (1983) suggest that the teacher begin by teaching a lesson under typical teaching conditions and collect observation or permanent product data on each student's performance; then the teacher would systematically vary the size of the group, the instructional appraoch, and the amount and intensity of teacher involvement. The teacher would note student responses and accomplishments under different conditions and by the end of the assessment, he would have a record of how to teach each student.

Trial teaching provides a useful initial assessment of how to teach, but ongoing evaluations of student performance add invaluable data. Mirkin and Deno (1979) suggested that teachers collect daily performance measures and compare them to a projected rated progress

in relation to IEP goals. This rate of daily increase is plotted on a graph after the teacher has set the performance goal and a target date and determines the rate of daily increase that will be required.

Although there is evidence that the more frequently a student's progress is evaluated the better the student's learning will be, daily recording is not required for this post hoc assessment strategy to work. There is growing evidence that using a data-based approach to monitor student progress and to trigger changes in the instructional program is more effective in increasing student achievement than simple informal teacher observations of student's progress. (Zigmond and Miller, 1986).

In summary, research studies corroborate that teacher behavior - what teachers say and do in the classroom - has a critical effect on student learning. In special education settings teachers have an important role to play in managing the classroom environment to facilitate development of social and academic behavior. If handicapped students are to make adequate progress, teachers must manage the classroom so that students are engaged in relevant academic tasks and provided adequate academic practice. By paying careful attention to classroom management, instructional organization, and lesson presentation, teachers can have a critical impact on student learning (Englert, 1984).

## Consultation

The third major function of a special educator is that of consultation. This includes consulting with general education teachers, consulting with other school personnel such as administrators, psychologists, and counselors, and consulting with parents.

According to a recent national report, over two-thirds of our nation's handicapped students receive the majority of their education in the regular classroom. This change has provided additional impetus for both regular and special educators to communicate regarding the educational programs of handicapped students for whom they share responsibility (West and Cannon, 1988).

In a follow-up study of graduates of The Resource/Consulting Teacher Program at the University of Illinois, Idol-Maestas and Ritter (1985) identified the necessity of thirty skills in their preparation program. The skills related as being most necessary for their job included assessing study and behavior skills, participating in staffing conferences, developing written IEP's, locating available instructional materials, and generating methods/activities for specific objectives.

Idol and West (1987) in their review of eight major special education consultation training programs in universities across this country, found that the University of Pittsburgh's training program was the only one that made any attempt at expert validation of competencies needed by special educators serving as consultants. Of the competencies surveyed, those receiving the highest ratings were establishing collaborative problem - solving relationships, participating in student placement procedures, collaborating with others in academic program implementation and use of instructional materials, and coordinating programs to effect changes in student's social and behavioral adjustment.

One form of educational support service increasingly used to assist exceptional children in regular classrooms involves collaborative

consultation or problem solving between the classroom teacher and the special education teacher.

> Collaborative consultation is an interactive process that enables people with diverse expertise to generate creative solutions to mutually defined problems. The outcome is enhanced, altered, and produces solutions that are different from those those that the individual team members would produce independently. The major outcome of collaborative consultation is to provide comprehensive and effective programs for students with special needs within the most appropriate context, thereby enabling them to achieve maximum constructive interaction with their non-handicapped peers (Idol, Paolucci - Whitcomb, and Nevin, 1986, p. 1)

Idol and West (1987) viewed consultation as an artful science with training required in both the technical skills of effective teaching (e.g., curriculum-based assessment curricular modification, classroom and behavior management, planning and implementation of IEP's) as well as in communicative/interactive skills (e.g., active listening and responding, conflict and stress management, systematic decision making and problem solving).

In looking at communicative/interactive skills West and Cannon (1988) identified nine competency areas for consultation:

1. Consultation Theory/Models
2. Research on Consultation Theory
3. Personal Characteristics
4. Interactive Communication
5. Collaborative Problem Solving
6. Systems change
7. Equity Issues and Values/Beliefs System
8. Staff Development
9. Evaluation of Consultation Effectivcness

(See Table)

Of the nine, the competencies that were rated as most important to the consultation process were skills in interactive communication, collaborative problem-solving, and personal characteristics. Skills in evaluating the effectiveness of consultation is also essential.

The results of their study indicate the importance of consultation skills and the necessity of the improvement of training and practice involving regular and special educators. Many teacher preparation programs are beginning to address the need for the development of consultation skills. The pre-service preparation of both regular and special education teacher trainees together will provide for better transition to actual school situations in which the classroom and special education teachers share instructional responsibility for mainstreamed exceptional students. Similarly, joint inservice training of school based

teams of regular and special educators in a common core of essential consultation competencies should assist in building effective educational support services for exceptional and at-risk students in the regular classroom (West and Cannon, 1988).

## Administration

The final area mentioned in research is that of administrative duties. Administrative duties include such duties as serving on multi-disciplinary teams, assisting or developing IEP's, and completing the required paperwork in order to assure state and federal compliance with P.L. 94-142 and the Creech Bill. Other administrative duties include the scheduling of students, the development and evaluation of programs, and making formal in-service presentations concerning the needs of handicapped students, demonstrating techniques to individualize instruction and improve behavior management. (Friend and McNutt, 1987).

All exceptional children's teachers in Washington participate as either members or chairmen of the Screening Committee, or School Based Committees. They assist in the referral process by making the initial contact positive and productive. The beginning event in most referral situations takes place when the regular educator informally approaches the special teacher in the teacher's lounge, hallway or classroom. Special educators have a responsibility for leaving the teacher with the feeling that he or she has been listened to and helped (White and Calhoun, 1987). After the initial contact, the special educator assists with the screening process. Those who are members of the screening team assist in providing intervention strategies that can be incorporated in

the regular classroom for a period of three to six weeks. Members are also involved with observing the child in the classroom and making initial parent contacts.

Even though a formal referral is the responsibility of the referring teacher, most exceptional children's teachers assist with this process by reviewing the form to make sure that it is filled out correctly.

Exceptional children's teachers who serve on the school based committee are actively involved in interpreting test results and making decisions about the placement of children. If the decision is made not to place a child, classroom teachers are often disappointed and disallusioned with the referral process. The special educator often feels responsible for "soothing" the disappointed teacher.

The skills necessary to work effectively with other professionals and parents fall into the broad area of communication and consulting skills. Exceptional children's personnel often communicate in their own "professional jargon" that is not always understood by people outside the profession, especially parents.

The completion of the necessary paperwork is an essential requirement for teachers of excpetional children. It is the teacher's responsibility to ensure that all legal components are included in the process (from referral to placement) and that all the required forms are completed. Due to the ever increasing number of due process hearings and lawsuits, it is necessary to "cover" oneself legally and to ensure that handicapped children are educated within the rights guaranteed by the Education For All Handicapped Children Act. The paperwork requirement

is also necessary in order to protect state funding to local school systems now that unannounced audits are being made by the Controller's office in Raleigh and funding is being reverted dut to out-of-compliance issues.

## Summary

Based on the research summarized in this paper, instruction is only one of four major competency areas required for exceptional children's teachers. The other areas: assessment, consultation, and administrative duties are indirectly related to instruction. Since instruction is the predominate feature of the N. C. Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument, it is felt that a revised instrument needs to be developed in order to assess the other three competencies. Therefore, a proposed instrument is attached. It is felt that the N. C. Appraisal Instrument adequately covers the instructional area with slight modifications. However, instructional preparation is added, since this is a major component of the instructional area; then assessment, consultation, and administrative duties are added as major functions.

References

Anderson, L. M. (1984). The environment of instruction: the function of seatwork in a commercially developed curriculum. In G. G. Duffy, I. R. Rochler, and J. Mason (Eds.) Comprehension instruction: perspectives and suggestions (93-103). New York: Longman.

Arter, J. A. and Jenkins, J. R. (1977). Examining the benefits and prevalence of modality considerations in special education. Journal of Special Education. 11, 281-298.

Berliner, D. C. and Rosenshine, B. V. (1977). The acquisition of knowledge in the classroom. In R. C. Anderson, F. J. Spira and W. E. Montague (Eds). Schooling and the aquisition of knowledge (375-396). Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum.

Bickel, William and Bickel, Donna. (1986). Effective Schools, classrooms, and instruction: implications for special education. Exceptional Children. 52, 489-500.

Bijou, S. W. (1970). What psychology has to offer education - now. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis. 3, 65-71.

Carnine, D. W. (1981). High and low implementation of direct instruction teaching techniques. Education and Treatment of Children. 4, 43-51.

Dugoff, Sandra K., Ives, Rita K., and Shotel, Jay R. (1985). Public school and university staff perceptions of the role of the resource teacher. Teacher Education and Special Education. 8, 75-82.

Englert, Carol Sue. (1984). Measuring teacher effectiveness from the teacher's point of view. Focus On Exceptional Children. 17, 1-15.

Englert, C. S. and Thomas, C. C. (1982). Management of task involvement in special education classrooms. Teacher Education and Special Education. 5, 3-10.

Evertson, C. M. and Emmer, E. T. (1982). Effective management at the beginning of the school year in junior high classes. Journal of Educational Psychology. 74, 485-498.

Friend, Marily, and McNutt, Gaye. (1987). A comparative study of resource teacher job descriptions and administrator's perceptions of resource teacher responsibilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities. 20, 224-228.

Guskey, T. R. (1980). Individualizing within the group-centered classroom. The mastery learning model. Teacher Education and Special Education. 4, 47-54.

Kerr, M. M. and Nelson, C. M. (1983). Strategies for managing behavior problems in the classroom. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

Kounin, J. (1970). Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Leinhardt, G., Zimond, N., and Cooley, W. W. (1981). Reading instruction and its effects. American Educational Research Journal. 18, 343-361.

Lyon, S. R. and Sainato, D. M. (1985). Group instruction for handicapped students: A review of empirical efforts. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Mirkin, P. K. and Deno, S. L. (1979). Formative evaluation in the classroom: An approach to improving instruction. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities.

Resnick, L. B., Wang, M. C., and Kaplin, J. (1973). Task analysis in curriculum design: A hierarchically sequenced introductory mathematics curriculum. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis. 6, 679-710.

Rosenshine, B. (1980). How time is spent in elementary classrooms. In C. Deham and A. Lieberman, (Eds.). Time to learn. (107-126). Washington, D. C. National Institute of Education.

Rosenshine, B. V. (1983). Teaching functions in instructional programs. The Elementary School Journal. 83, 335-352.

Solomon, G. (1972). Heuristic models for the genration of aptitude - treatment interaction hypotheses. Review of Educational Research. 42, 327-343.

Stamm, John M. (1980). Teacher competencies: Recommendations for personal preparation. Teacher Education and Special Education. 3, 52-57.

Vincent, L. J., Salisbury, C., Walter, G., Brown, P., Gruenweald, L. J., and Powers, M. (1981). Program evaluation and curriculum development in early childhood/special ecucation. In W. Sailor, B. Wilcox, and L. Brown (Eds.). Methods of instruction for severly handicapped students. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks.

West, J. Frederick, and Cannon, Glenda S. (1988). Essential collaborative consultation competencies for regular and special educators. Journal of Learning Disabilities. 21, 56-63.

White, Richard, and Calhoun, Mary Lynne. (1987). From referral to placement: Teacher's perceptions of their responsibilities. Exceptional Children. 53, 460-468.

Zigmond, N., Kerr, M. M., Brown, G., and Harris, A. L. (1984). School survival skills in secondary school age education students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Baton Rouge, LA.

Zigmond, N., and Miller, Sandra E. (1986). Assessment for instructional planning. Exceptional Children. 52, 501-509.

Zigmond, N., Vallecoisa, A., and Silverman, R. (1983). Assessment for instructional planning in special education. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Table I

Self Rating Scale for Classroom Management

Respond to each item in terms of the extent to which it describes yourself:

(1) Not at all descriptive
(2) Descriptive to a small extent
(3) Descriptive to a moderate extent
(4) Descriptive to a large extent
(5) Descriptive to an extremely large extent

| Competencies | | Performance Evaluation |
|---|---|---|
| **Classroom Set-up and Organization** | | |
| 1.1 | Arranges physical space and instructional materials to minimize disruptive movement around classroom and to facilitate easy access to high-use materials. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1.2 | Establishes and implements minimally disruptive traffic patterns and procedures. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1.3 | Establishes and implements procedures for nonacademic business (e.g., tardiness, material use, movement in and out of room, distributing materials, talk among students, bathroom breaks). | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1.4 | Establishes and implements procedures for academic business (e.g., seatwork procedures, obtaining help, volunteer behavior during small group, learning centers set-up and take-down of lessons). | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| **Teaching Rules and Procedures** | | |
| 2.1 | Communicates clearly what behavior will be tolerated and what will not. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.2 | Gives behavior reminders and statements of desired behavior in advance of activity. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.3 | Clearly introduces rules, procedures, and consequences at beginning of school year and whenever needed. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.4 | States rules, posts rules, and provides discussion of rules at the time of their introduction. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.5 | Presents examples and non-examples of rules and procedures. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.6 | Requires student rehearsal of rules and procedures. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.7 | Monitors rule compliance and provides specific behavioral feedback during. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.8 | Consequates rule noncompliance by stopping inappropriate behavior immediately and requiring students to practice the procedure until it is performed automatically. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Maintaining Rules and Procedures

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3.1 | Positions self in the room to provide high degree of visibility (e.g., can make eye contact with all students) | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.2 | Scans constantly and makes eye contact with all students on an equal basis. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.3 | Detects disruptive behavior early and cites rule or procedure in responding to disruptive behavior. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.4 | Reinforces appropriate performance through specific praise statements (e.g., states specific behaviors). | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.5 | Administers praise contingently. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.6 | Includes students in the management of their own behavior. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.7 | Uses nonverbal signals to direct students when teaching other groups of students. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Table II

Instructional Organization

| Competencies | Performance Evaluation |
|---|---|
| **Allocated Time** | |
| 1.1 Maximizes time in instruction by scheduling students in direct instruction (e.g., interacts with 70% or more of the students per hour). | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1.2 Minimizes time in non-instructional activities (e.g., spends 80% or more of class time in instructional activities). | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1.3 Keeps transition time between lessons short (e.g., no more than 3 minutes between change of students and activity; no more than 30 seconds when a change of activity only). | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1.4 Establishes procedures for lessons that signal a clear beginning and end. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1.5 Gains all students' attention at the beginning of the lesson and maintains student attention during lessons at 90% level. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1.6 Prepares students for transition in advance by stating behavioral expectations and informing students that lesson is drawing to a close. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| **Engaged Time** | |
| 2.1 Maintains students' attention during seatwork at 80% levels or higher. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.2 Monitors seatwork students continuously through eye scanning. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.3 Circulates among seatwork students between lessons to assist students and to monitor progress. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.4 Maintains seatwork accuracy at 90% level or higher. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.5 Tells rationale for seatwork and communicates the importance of the assignment. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.6 Provides active forms of seatwork practice clearly related to academic goals. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.7 Sets seatwork and assignment standards (neatness, accuracy, due dates). | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.8 Uses tutoring (e.g., peer, volunteers, aides) and other specialized instructional technology to increase opportunity for active academic responding during seatwork. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.9 | Establishes procedures for early finishers, | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2.10 | Schedules time to review seatwork. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2.11 | Requires that students correct work and make up missed or unfinished work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2.12 | Gives informative feedback to students in making written or verbal corrections. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Table III

Teaching Presentation

| Competencies | Performance Evaluation |
|---|---|
| **Lesson Presentation - Introduction Phase** | |
| 1.1 Reviews prior learning by requiring active student recitation or practice of previous day's skills. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1.2 States the objective of the lesson and communicates to students what they will be expected to do to demonstrate mastery of the new skill. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1.3 Provides an overview of the lesson. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1.4 Relates new concepts to old by stating how a new skill is like or different from those the student already knows. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1.5 Activates the student's prior experiences to aid comprehension and understanding. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1.6 Conveys purposefulness for learning by stating the rationale. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| **Demonstration Phase** | |
| 2.1 Models topography of behavior response for factual learning, and models steps of a procedure in procedural learning. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.2 Requires students to rehearse new behaviors and procedures based on imitation of the teacher's model. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.3 Points out distinctive features of new concepts. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.4 States concept definition and provides rehearsal. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.5 Presents many examples and nonexamples of new concepts or generalization and explains why they are examples or nonexamples. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.6 Provides discrimination activities (e.g., series of examples and nonexamples) to test student performance and understanding. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.7 Asks students to give rationale or explain decision in determining why particular instances are examples or nonexamples of the concept. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.8 Delivers specific cues and prompts prior to the initiation of student response, to maintain accuracy above 80%. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2.9 | Asks frequent questions to test understanding and provides opportunities for academic practice. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| | Extended Practice Phase and Evaluation | |
| 3.1 | Repeats practice opportunities until students are not making errors. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.2 | Uses error correction procedures (e.g., prompts or models) rather than tell answer or call on another student. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.3 | Provides error drill by repeatedly presenting concepts on which students have erred. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.4 | Follows up on correct responses with coningent and specific praise. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.5 | Maintains a brisk pace during the lesson. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.6 | Provides daily, weekly, and monthly reviews. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.7 | Provides frequent tests to determine students' mastery of academic objectives. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.8 | Reteaches or makes instructional decision on the basis of students' performance on tests. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.9 | Maintains continuous records and graphs of student progress. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Table IV

Essential Collaborative Consultation Competencies
For Regular and Special Educators

I. Consultation Theory/Models

Regular and special educators engaging in collaborative consultation will:

1. Practice reciprocity of roles between consultant and consultee in facilitating the consultation process.

2. Demonstrate knowledge of various stages/phases of the consultation process.

3. Assume joint responsibility for identifying each stage of the consultation process and adjusting behavior accordingly.

4. Match consultation approach(es) to specific consultation situation(s), setting(s), and need(s).

II. Research on Consultation Theory, Training, and Practice

Regular and special educators engaging in collaborative consultation will:

5. Translate relevant consultation research findings into effective school-based consultation practice.

Personal Characteristics
Regular and special educators engaging in collaborative consultation will:

6. Exhibit ability to be caring, respectful, empathic, congruent, and open in consultation interactions.

7. Establish and maintain rapport with all persons involved in the consultation process, in both formal and informal interactions.

8. Identify and implement appropriate responses to stage of professional development of all persons involved in the consultation process.

9. Maintain positive self-concept and enthusiastic attitude throughout the consultation process.

10. Demonstrate willingness to learn from others throughout the consultation process.

11. Facilitate progress in consultation situations by managing personal stress, maintaning calm in time of crisis, taking risks, and remaining flexible and resilient.

12. Respect divergent points of view, acknowledging the right to hold different views and to act in accordance with convictions.

III. Interactive Communication

Regular and special educators engaging in collaborative consultation will:

13. Communicate clearly and effectively in oral and written form.

14. Utilize active ongoing listening and responding skills to facilitate the consultation process (e.g., acknowledging, paraphrasing, reflecting, clarifying, elaborating, summarizing).

15. Determine own and others' willingness to enter consultative relationship.

16. Adjust consultation approach to the learning stage of individuals involved in the consultation process.

17. Exhibit ability to grasp and validate overt/covert meaning and affect in communications (perceptive).

18. Interpret nonverbal communications of self and others (e.g., eye contact, body language, personal boundaries in space) in appropriate context.

19. Interview effectively to elicit information, share information, explore problems, set goals and objectives.

20. Pursue issues with appropriate persistence once they arise in consultation process.

21. Give and solicit continuous feedback which is specific, immediate, and objective.

22. Give credit to others for their ideas and accomplishments.

23. Manage conflict and confrontation skillfully throughout the consultation process to maintain collaborative relationships.

24. Manage timing of consultation activities to facilitate mutual decision making at each stage of the consultation process.

25. Apply the principle of positive reinforcement to one another in the collaborative team situation.

26. Be willing and safe enough to say, "I don't know... let's find out."

IV. Collaborative Problem Solving

Regular and special educators engaging in collaborative consultation will:

27. Recognize that successful and lasting solutions require commonality of goals and collaboration throughout all phases of the problem-solving process.

28. Develop a variety of data collection techniques for problem identification and clarification.

29. Generate viable alternatives through brainstorming techniques characterized by active listening, non-judgmental responding, and appropriate reframing.

30. Evaluate alternatives to anticipate possible consequences, narrow and combine choices, and assign priorities.

31. Integrate solutions into a flexible, feasible, and easily implemented plan of action relevant to all persons affected by the problem.

32. Adopt a "pilot problem-solving" attitude, recognizing that adjustments to the plan of action are to be expected.

33. Remain available throughout implementation for support, modeling, and/or assistance in modification.

34. Redesign, maintain, or discontinue interventions using data-based evaluation.

35. Utilize observation, feedback, and interviewing skills to increase objectivity and mutuality throughout the problem-solving process.

V. Systems Change

Regular and special educators engaging in collaborative consultation will:

36. Develop role as a change agent (e.g., implementing strategies for gaining support, overcoming resistance).

37. Identify benefits and negative effects which could result from change efforts.

VI. Equity Issues and Values/Belief Systems

Regular and special educators engaging in collaborative consultation will:

38. Facilitate equal learning opportunities by showing respect for individual differences in physical appearance, race, sex, handicap, ethnicity, religion, socio-economic status, or ability.

39. Advocate for services which accommodate the educational, social, and vocational needs of all students, handicapped and nonhandicapped.

40. Encourage implementation of laws and regulations designed to provide appropriate education for all handicapped students.

41. Utilize principles of the least restrictive enviornment in all decisions regarding handicapped students.

42. Modify myths, beliefs, and attitudes which impede successful social and educational integration of handicapped students into the least restrictive environment.

43. Recognize, respect, and respond appropriately to the effects of personal values, beliefs system of self and others in the consultation process.

44. Ensure that persons involved in planning and implementing the consultation process are also involved in its evaluation.

45. Evaluate the impact of input, porcess, and outcome variables on desired consultation outcomes.

46. Engage in self-evaluation of strengths and weaknesses to modify personal behaviors influencing the consultation process.

47. Utilize continuous evaluative feedback to maintain, revise, or terminate consultation activities.

Table V

Functions of the Resource Teacher

1. Develop objectives for each child jointly with classroom teachers, working together to implement these objectives. (1)*
2. Make formal inservice presentations concerning the needs of handicapped students, demonstrating techniques to individualize instruction and improve behavior management. (2)
3. Direct small group and individual instruction with a remedial/academic emphasis in the regular classroom. (1)
4. Inform teachers of materials and strategies necessary to meet individual needs in reading, math, spelling, handwriting and written expression, supplying follow-up materials to the classroom teachers. (2)
5. Team teach in the regular classroom as an alternative to direct resource service. (1)
6. Observe student in the regular classroom and gather additional information from classroom teacher regarding student's performance to plan a referred student's individual educational program. (3)
7. Consult with parents of students served to report the results of assessment, programming, and on-going progress to develop communication about the needs of the child. (2)
8. Administer standardized tests; compile information regarding student's present and past performance to determine if student is handicapped and to plan a handicapped student's individual educational program. (3)
9. Develop a profile of the student's abilities, needs, and learning style as a basis for programming, informing the classroom teacher of student's strengths and needs. (3)
10. Set up a peer tutoring and/or volunteer program that can be used in the regular classroom. (1)
11. Coordinate instructional materials used in the resource program with the materials used by the regular classroom teacher. (1)
12. Teach classroom teacher how to administer and use individual diagnostic tests. (3)
13. Direct small groups and individual instruction with a remedial/academic emphasis in the resource room. (1)

14. Develop a cooperative relationship with classroom teachers through routinely scheduled meetings related to student progress and program planning, providing input into parent conferences, grades on report cards and retention decisions. (2)

15. Share a checklist or other referral data to aid classroom teachers in identifying students who qualify for special education services. (2)

16. Work with classroom teachers to help each child understand his strengths and needs and develop a positive attitude toward learning. (2)

17. Provide supplementary instruction to students by preteaching lessons prior to classroom instruction and/or postteaching lessons to students after student has received instruction in the classroom. (1)

18. Provide regular education staff with professional books and information about the characteristics and learning needs of handicapped students as well as information on trends, legislation, and litigation. (2)

*1 = instruction function
2 = consultation function
3 = assessment function

Table VI

Competency Areas
for
Teachers of the Handicapped

| Statements | Source(s) | Data Base* |
|---|---|---|
| I. General Knowledge | | |
| 1. Knowledge of normative child growth development (cognitive, language, social, motor, behavioral) | Biacchi (1979<br>Burke & Cohen (1977)<br>Kahn (1979)<br>Southeastern Regional Coalition (1982)<br>Stainback, Stainback, & Maurer (1976)<br>Stainback, Stainback, Schmid, & Courtnage (1977)<br>Switzky, Rotatori, Miller, & Freogon (1979) | PC<br>PC<br>OS<br>O<br>O<br>O<br>OS |
| 2. Knowledge of preacademic learning processes (tracking, responding, lifting head, reaching, grasping) | Stainback et al. (1976) | O |
| 3. Knowledge of the educational history of handicapped students | Burke & Cohen (1977) | PC |
| 4. Knowledge of right-to-education laws | Burke & Cohen (1977) | PC |
| 5. Knowledge of normalization principles | Horner (1977)<br>Tucker & Horner (1977) | OS |
| 6. Knowledge of new educational materials, methods, and issues through professional journals, courses, and staff development activities | Biacchi (1979)<br>Dunlap et al. (1979) | PC<br>O |
| 7. Knowledge of community resources (health, social, etc.) | Biacchi (1979)<br>Stainback et al. (1976) | OS<br>O |
| II. Planning | | |
| 1. Ability to write an individual educational plan | Biacchi (1979)<br>Ruso & Stark (1976) | PC<br>PC |
| 2. Ability to write specific instructional or behavioral objectives | Biacchi (1979)<br>Burke & Cohen (1977)<br>Horner (1977)<br>Milne (1979) | PC<br>PC<br>OS<br>PC |

| Statements | Source(s) | Data Base* |
|---|---|---|
| | Somerton-Fair, Sedlak, Turner, & Grotsky (1978) | O |
| | Tucker & Horner (1977) | O |
| 3. Ability to conduct task analyses | Biacchi (1979) | PC |
| | Burke & Cohen (1977) | PC |
| | Fredericks et al. (1979) | SG |
| | Haring (1975) | O |
| | Horner (1977) | OS |
| | Stainback et al. (1976) | OS |
| | Stainback et al. (1977) | O |
| | Tucker & Horner (1977) | O |
| | Williams et al. (1975) | O |
| 4. Ability to develop or select instructional materials | Bicchi (1979) | PC |
| | Burke & Cohen (1977) | PC |
| | Haring (1975) | O |
| 5. Ability to plan a synchronized time schedule | Stainback & Stainback (in Thomas, 1980) | O |
| III. Assessment | | |
| 1. Knowledge of instrumentation and procedures appropriate for screening, diagnosis, and educational assessment | Burke & Cohen (1977) | PC |
| | Horner (1977) | O |
| | Smith (1980) | PC |
| | Southeastern Regional Coalition (1982) | O |
| 2. Ability to conduct a student profile based on observational data and formal and informal assessment | Biacchi (1979) | PC |
| 3. Ability to collect continuous performance data and to assess current functioning in relation to specific behavioral objectives | Biacchi (1979) | PC |
| | Haring (1975) | O |
| | Horner (1977) | OS |
| | Milne (1979) | PC |
| | Somerton-Fair et al. (1978) | O |
| | Tawney & Smith (1981) | O |
| | Thurman & Hare (1979) | O |
| 4. Ability to comprehend and interpret diagnostic reports | Biacchi (1979) | PC |
| | Stainback et al. (1976) | O |
| IV. Curriculum | | |
| 1. Ability to develop a curriculum that: | | |
| a. Includes content from primary learning domains | Southeastern Regional Coalition (1982) | O |

| Statements | Source(s) | Data Base* |
|---|---|---|
| b. Is age appropriate | Brown et al. (1979) | O |
| c. Is functional | Brown et al. (1979) | O |
| d. Makes use of the natural environment | Williams et al. (1975) | OS |
| | Brown et al. (1979) | O |
| 2. Develops or uses a curriculum that includes the following content: | | |
| a. Attention training | Smith (1980) | PC |
| | Wehman & McLaughlin (1979) | OS |
| b. Sensory-motor skills | Burke & Cohen (1977) | PC |
| | Horner (1977) | OS |
| | Ruso & Stark (1976) | PC |
| | Sontag et al. (1973) | O |
| | Stainback et al. (1976) | O |
| c. Speaking, imitating, relating to social stimuli | Milne (1979) | PC |
| | Sontag et al. (1973) | O |
| | Stainback et al. (1976) | O |
| d. Language development skills | Burke & Cohen (1977) | PC |
| | Horner (1977) | OS |
| | Milne (1979) | PC |
| | Ruso & Stark (1976) | PC |
| | Sontag, Smith, & Sailor (1977 | O |
| | Stainback et al. (1976) | O |
| | Stainback et al. (1977) | O |
| e. Selfhelp/daily living skills | Burke & Cohen (1977) | PC |
| | Horner (1977) | OS |
| | Milne (1979) | PC |
| | Ruso & Stark (1976) | PC |
| | Sontag et al. (1973) | O |
| | Sontag et al. (1977) | O |
| | Stainback et al. (1976) | O |
| | Stainback et al. (1977) | O |
| f. Toileting skills | Sontag et al. (1973) | O |
| | Stainback et al. (1976) | O |
| g. Social/recreational skills | Burke & Cohen (1977) | PC |
| | Horner (1977) | OS |
| | Milne (1979) | PC |
| | Sontag et al. (1977) | O |
| | Stainback et al. (1976) | O |
| h. Pre-academic and academic skills | Burke & Cohen (1977) | PC |
| | Milne (1979) | PC |
| | Sontag et al. (1973) | O |
| | Stainback et al. (1976) | O |
| i. Mobility skills/ambulation | Sontag et al. (1973) | O |
| | Sontag et al. (1977) | O |
| | Stainback et al. (1977) | O |
| j. Physical fitness | Milne (1979 | PC |
| | Sontag et al. (1973) | O |
| k. Enrichment (expansion of interests) | Milne (1979) | PC |

| Statements | Source(s) | Data Base* |
|---|---|---|
| V. Behavior Management | | |
| 1. Ability to generally use appropriate behavior management techniques | Burke & Cohen (1977) | PC |
| | Dunlap et al. (1979) | OS |
| | Hundert (1982) | O |
| | Johnson et al. (1980) | OS |
| | Koegel et al. (1977) | SG |
| | Milne (1979) | PC |
| | Sontag et al. (1973 | O |
| | Sontag et al. (1977) | O |
| | Stainback et al. (1976) | OS |
| | Stainback et al. (1977) | O |
| 2. Ability to use the following specific tactics: | | |
| a. Contingent reinforcement | Binford, Berdine, & Shire (1981) | OS |
| | Haring (1975) | O |
| | Horner (1977) | OS |
| | Stainback et al. (1976) | O |
| | Tucker & Horner (1977) | O |
| | Wehman & McLaughlin (1979) | OS |
| b. Behavior reduction tactics (including overcorrection) to control self-abuse, temper tantrums, avoidance behavior, etc. | Smith (1980) | PC |
| | Sontag et al. (1973) | O |
| | Wehman & McLaughlin (1979) | OS |
| | Johnson et al. (1980) | O |
| c. Precise behavior measurement | Stainback et al. (1976) | O |
| | Tucker & Horner (1977) | O |
| d. Graphically charting a student's behavior | Biacchi (1979) | PC |
| IV. Instruction | | |
| 1. Conducts direct or systematic instruction | Tawney & Smith (1981) | O |
| a. Using successive approximation procedures | Katz et al. (1977) | SG |
| b. Using errorless learning procedures | Tawney & Smith (1981) | O |
| | Burke & Cohen (1977) | PC |
| c. Based on assessment data | Somerton-Fair et al. (1978) | O |
| | Tucker & Horner (1977) | O |
| d. For the acquisition, maintenance, and generalization of behavior | Horner (1977) | OS |
| | Southeastern Regional coalition (1982) | O |
| | Tucker & Horner (1977) | O |
| 2. Manages program and tasks | Milne (1979) | PC |
| a. Demonstrating flexibility in management of learning activities | Milne (1979) | PC |
| b. Using appropriate grouping techniques | Johnson et al. (1980) | O |
| c. Using a high percentage of minutes for instruction per day | Burke & Cohen (1977) | PC |
| | Fredericks et al. (1979) | SG |
| | Stainback & Stainback (in Thomas, 1980) | OS |

| Statements | Source(s) | Data Base* |
|---|---|---|
| **VII. Physical/Medical** | | |
| 1. Knowledge of basic anatomy and physiology | Burke & Cohen (1977) | PC |
| 2. Knowledge of various clinical syndromes | Stainback et al. (1976) | O |
| 3. Ability to use physical positioning techniques | Sontag et al. (1973) | O |
| 4. Ability to administer medicine with awareness of side effects | Sontag et al. (1973) | O |
| 5. Ability to assist student having a seizure | Burke & Cohen (1977)<br>Sontag et al. (1973) | PC<br>O |
| 6. Ability to use prosthetic aids | Burke & Cohen (1977)<br>Horner (1977)<br>Southeastern Regional Coalition (1982)<br>Stainback et al. (1976) | PC<br>O<br>O<br>O |
| **VIII. Other Personnel** | | |
| 1. Communicate, engage in teamwork, and work effectively with other professionals within the school and community | Biacchi (1979)<br>Burke & Cohen (1977)<br>Haring (1975)<br>Milne (1979)<br>Ruso & Stark (1976)<br>Stainback et al. (1976)<br>Stainback et al. (1977)<br>Stainback & Stainback (in Thomas, 1980) | PC<br>PC<br>O<br>PC<br>PC<br>O<br>O<br>O |
| 2. Supervise paraprofessional personnel | Burke & Cohen (1977)<br>Horner (1977)<br>Stainback et al. (1977)<br>Tucker & Horner (1977) | PC<br>O<br>O<br>O |
| **IX. Parents** | | |
| 1. Interacts effectively with parents regarding student's ability, educational plan, and progress | Biacchi (1979)<br>Burke & Cohen (1977)<br>Ruso & Stark (1976)<br>Sontag et al. (1977)<br>Stainback et al. (1976)<br>Stainback et al. (1977) | PC<br>PC<br>PC<br>O<br>O<br>O |
| 2. Provides parent counseling | Tucker & Horner (1977) | O |
| 3. Provides parent training | Burke & Cohen (1977)<br>Sontag et al. (1973)<br>Stainback et al. (1976) | PC<br>O<br>O |

| Statements | Source(s) | Data Base* |
|---|---|---|
| a. In behavioral principles | Haring (1975) | O |
| | Horner (1977) | OS |
| b. In lifting, carrying, and positioning | Stainback et al. (1976) | O |
| c. In effective communication | Biacchi (1979) | PC |
| d. In using state, community, public, and private services | Biacchi (1979) | PC |
| e. In providing information on sources for clothing, equipment, etc. | Stainback et al. (1976) | O |

* O = Author's opinion
OS = Opinion with substanitation from literature
PC = Professional consensus
SG = Research indicating gains in student achievement

Table VII

Competency Areas For Teachers
of
Students With Learning Disabilities

| Competency | Source | Type* |
|---|---|---|
| I. General/Special Knowledge | | |
| 1. Knowledge of normal range of individual differences and deviations in human growth/development (e.g., discuss normal language development and possible deviations) | Newcomer (1982) | PO |
| | Zedler (1970) | PO |
| | Shuster (1973) | PO |
| 2. Knowledge of the way normal children learn basic academic skills, and difficulties encountered by LD students. | Newcomer (1982) | PO |
| | Zedler (1970) | PO |
| | Shuster (1973) | PO |
| II. Planning/Evaluation | | |
| 3. Plan remedial instruction for small groups/individuals based on data showing discrepancy between LD student's Performance and school's goal | Lovitt (1975) | TR |
| | Beattie, Grise, & Algozzine (1983) | ER |
| | Grise, Beattie, & Algozzine (1982) | ER |
| | Heron & Skinner (1981) | TR |
| 4. Plan lessons and activities based on diagnostic information about each student's specific learning deficit, such as focusing attention on learning task | Van Nagel (1976) | PO |
| | Heron & Skinner (1981) | TR |
| | Nagle & Thwaite (1979) | PO |
| | Estes & Huzinga (1974) | PO |
| | Lovitt & Hansen (1976) | PO |
| | Foster & Torgesen (1983) | DS |
| | Reisberg (1982) | ER |
| | Ganchow, Wheeler, & Kretschmer (1982) | ER |
| | Lewis & Kass (1982) | DS |
| | Pihl & Niaura (1982) | DS |
| | Hallahan, Gajar, Cohen, & Tarver (1978) | PO |
| | Connors (1983) | TR |
| 5. Select/design materials and activities that match LD student's learning needs and lesson objectives (e.g., modify mode of presentation or demonstration of knowledge or simplify language/reading level) | Newcomer (1982) | PO |
| | Edgar & Neel (1976) | PO |
| | Gargiulo & Pigge (1979) | PO |
| | Zedler (1970) | PO |
| | Shuster (1973) | PO |
| | Schwartz & Oseroff (1972) | PO |
| | Van Nagel (1979) | PO |
| | Hessler & Kitchen (1980) | DS |
| | Noel (1980) | DS |

| Competency | Source | Type |
|---|---|---|
| | Wiig, Semel, & Abele (1981) | DS |
| | Poplin, Gray, Larsen, Banikowski & Mehring (1980) | DS |
| | Magee & Newxomer (1978) | DS |
| | Morsink & Otto (1977) | ER |
| | Blackhurst (1980) | PO |
| 6. Plan sequence of instruction which enables LD student to meet lesson objectives and reach long-term goals (i.e., task analyze objectives, provide for maintenance and generalization skills) | Zedler (1970) | PO |
| | Shuster (1973) | PO |
| | Schwartz & Oseroff (1972) | PO |
| | Van Nagel (1976) | PO |
| | Morsink & Otto (1977) | ER |
| | Lovitt (1975) | TR |
| | Rose & Gottlieb) 1981) | TR |
| 7. Plan continuous evaluation of LD student's achievement, basing decisions about changes on data collected | Edgar & Neel (1976) | PO |
| | Gargiulo & Pigge (1979) | PO |
| | Zedler (1970) | PO |
| | Shuster (1973) | PO |
| | Schwartz & Oseroff (1972) | PO |
| | Van Nagel (1976) | PO |
| III. Curriculum Content | | |
| 8. Awareness and ability to implement specialized academic programs for LD student (e.g., corrective reading programs or parallel alternate curricula for secondary LD students) | Newcomer (1982) | PO |
| | Zedler (1970) | PO |
| | Blackhurst (1980) | PO |
| | Morsink & Otto (1977) | ER |
| | Wiseman, Hartwell, & Hannafin (1980) | DS |
| 9. Knowledge of affective curricula for specific LD with social/interpersonal deficits | Lloyd, Cullinan, Kosiewicz, & Kneedler (1982) | PO |
| | Bryan & Bryan (1978) | PO |
| 10. Implement programs which help LD students engage in self-monitoring, predicting outcomes, and other deliberate attempts at studying/learning | Wong & Jones (1982) | PO |
| | Wong (1979) | PO |
| | Bryan & Bryan (1978) | PO |
| | Tollefson, Tracy, Johnson, Buenning, Farmer, & Barke (1982) | DS |
| | Deshler, Alley, Warner, & Schumaker (1981) | PO |
| | Kosiewicz, Hallahan, Lloyd, & Graves (1982) | ER |
| | Swanson (1981) | ER |
| | Hallahan, Hall, Ianna, Kneedler, Lloyd, Loper, & Reeve (1983) | TR |

| Competency | Source | Type |
|---|---|---|
| **IV. Clinical Teaching Strategies** | | |
| 11. Select appropriate clinical strategies for individual LD students. (e.g., does LD student learn decoding better in context or isolation?) | Bos (1982) | ER |
| | Smith & Lovitt (1976) | PO |
| | Estes & Huzinga (1974) | PO |
| | Reisberg (1982) | ER |
| | Ganchow, Wheeler, & Kretschmer (1982) | ER |
| | Deshler, Alley, Warner, & Schumaker (1981) | PO |
| 12. Apply direct instruction, using appropriate feedback, to teach mastery of basic skills | Lovitt & Hansen (1976) | PO |
| | Pflaum, Pascarella, Auer, Augustyn, & Boswick (1982) | PO |
| | Rose, McEntire, & Dowdy (1982) | ER |
| | Jenkins, Larson, & Fleisher (1983) | ER |
| | Pany, Jenkins, & Schreck (1982) | ER |
| | Foster & Torgesen (1983) | DS |
| | Lovitt (1975) | TR |
| | Sachs (1983) | ER |
| | Kosiewicz, Hallahan, Lloyd, & Graves (1982) | ER |
| 13. Involve LD students as active respondents in learning tasks rather than passive recipients of instruction (e.g., teach LD student questioning strategy to increase comprehension of main ideas) | Bos (1982) | ER |
| | Magee & Newcomer (1978) | DS |
| | Haines & Torgesen (1978) | ER |
| | Lewis & Kass (1982) | DS |
| | Grassi (1971) | ER |
| | Schumaker, Deshler, Alley, & Warner (1983) | TR |
| | Hallahan et al. (1983) | TR |
| 14. Decrease impulsive behavior, and increase problem-solving techniques | Nagle & Thwaite (1979) | PO |
| | Rosenbaum & Dabman (1979) | TR |
| | Lewis & Kass (1982) | DS |
| **V. Behavior Management** | | |
| 15. Implement behavior management system to increase appropriate and decrease inappropriate behaviors | Gargiulo & Pigge (1979) | PO |
| | Zedler (1970) | PO |
| | Shuster (1973) | PO |
| | Schwartz & Oseroff (1972) | PO |
| | Van Nagel (1976) | PO |
| | Lovitt (1975) | TR |
| 16. Prevent behavior problems in class by management of simultaneous activities (e.g., room arrangement, engineered classroom, self-correcting activities) | Newcomber (1982) | PO |
| | Shuster (1973 | PO |
| | Schwartz & Oseroff (1972) | TR |
| | Lovitt (1975) | TR |

*PO = professional opinion
ER = experimental research
DS = descriptive studies
TR = topical reviews

Table VIII

FORMATIVE OBSERVATION DATA INSTRUMENT

Instructions: Use this sheet to record anecdotally and sequentially those events which occur during the classroom observation. Be sure to code each instance of a TPAI practice as follows:

. appropriate use of practice
+ strong or positive use of practice
- weak or negative use of practice

| Practice | Time | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| 1. INSTRUCTIONAL TIME | | |
| 1.1 Materials ready | | |
| 1.2 Class started quickly | | |
| 1.3 Gets students on task | | |
| 1.4 Maintains high time-on-task | | |
| 2. STUDENT BEHAVIOR | | |
| 2.1 Rules - Administrative Matters | | |
| 2.2 Rules - Verbal Participation/Talk | | |
| 2.3 Rules - Movement | | |
| 2.4 Frequently monitors behavior | | |
| 2.5 Stops inappropriate behavior | | |
| 2.6 Ability to use appropriate behavior management techniques | | |
| 3. ASSESSMENT | | |
| 3.1 Conducts observation of referred students receiving services in the mainstream | | |
| 3.2 Selects appropriate assessment instruments | | |
| 3.3 Conducts both formal and informal assessment for instructional planning | | |
| 4. INSTRUCTIONAL PREPARATION | | |
| 4.1 Develops Individual Education Plan based on formal and informal assessment data | | |
| 4.2 Plans remedial instruction for small groups and/or individuals based on goals and objectives identified on the IEP. | | |
| 4.3 Plans lessons and activities based on diagnostic information about each student's specific learning deficit. | | |
| 4.4 Selects/designs materials that matches the student's learning needs and lesson objectives | | |
| 4.5 Plans sequencing of instruction which enables student to meet lesson objectives and reach long-term goals (i.e., task analyze objectives) | | |
| 4.6 Plans continuous evaluation of student's achievement, basing decisions about changes on data collected. | | |
| 5. INSTRUCTIONAL PRESENTATION | | |
| 5.1 Begins with review | | |
| 5.2 Introduces lesson | | |
| 5.3 Speaks fluently | | |
| 5.4 Lesson understandable | | |
| 5.5 Provides relevant examples | | |
| 5.6 High rate of success on tasks | | |
| 5.7 Appropriate level of questions | | |
| 5.8 Appropriate pacing of lesson | | |
| 5.9 Efficient, smooth transitions | | |
| 5.10 Assignment clear | | |
| 5.11 Summarizes main points | | |

DRAFT COPY

Assessment Instrument
for
Teachers of Exeptional Children



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| Practice | Time | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| 6. INSTRUCTIONAL FEEDBACK | | |
| 6.1 Uses oral/written work to assess progress | | |
| 6.2 Provides feedback on in-class work | | |
| 6.3 Provides prompt feedback on out-of-class work | | |
| 6.4 Affirms correct answers quickly and sustains feedback on incorrect answers | | |
| 7. COMMUNICATION/CONSULTATION | | |
| 7.1 Interacts effectively with parents regarding student's ability, educational plan and progress | | |
| 7.2 Consults with classroom teachers on a regular basis regarding the educational needs of mainstreamed students. | | |
| 7.3 Consults with other school personnel (administrators, school psychologists, and counselors) | | |
| 7.4 Establishes rapport with students | | |
| 8. ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES | | |
| 8.1 Carries out non-instructional duties | | |
| 8.2 Completes appropriate paperwork as required by state and federal laws and local policy | | |
| 8.3 Serves as member of screening and/or school based committees | | |
| 8.4 Plan for professional development | | |